to be the only substance, though that be a thing,
which Aristotle himself justly reprehends them for also in these words of his, 6W Metaph. *i*1.

c. 7.p. 274.

l&v ovv ev re TO Trav /cat jutav eivat rtva ^>v<nv, torn. iv. oper.

OT]Aov on 7roAAav'W£ ajuapTavovcrt, TWV *yap ra crrot^aa rtfleacri ftovov, TO! V§€ a<Tcojuara>v ov,

at dcrwjuarwv* They who suppose the world to be one uniform thing, and acknowledge only one nature as the matter, and this corporeal or indued with magnitude, it is evident, that they err rnany ways, and particularly in this, that they set down only the elements of bodies, and not of incorporeal things, though there be also things incorporeal.—I say, we have not concluded them Atheists, merely for this reason, because they denied incorporeal substance, but because they deduced all things whatsoever from dead and stupid matter, and made every thing in the world, besides the bare substance of matter, devoid of all quality, generable and corruptible.

Now we shall take notice of an objection, made by some late writers, against this Aristotelic accusation of the old philosophers, founded upon a passage of Aristotle's own, who elsewhere, in his book ***JDe*** *Ccelo,* speaking £; ^|; ^ of the heaven or world, plainly affirms, i-$^{0}?^{6}$*-

, yevojuevov juev *ovv* aTravreg aval ^acriv, **that all**

the philosophers before himself did assert the world to have been made, or have had a beginning.—From whence these writers infer, that therefore they must needs be all Theists, and hold tbe Divine creation of the world; and consequently, . that Aristotle contradicts himself, in representing many of thenr as Atkeists, acknowledging only